

**REMARKS**

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search. By this response, Claims 2–6, 8, 10, 15–17, 20, 23, 24, 27, 30–34, 36, 38, 43–45, 50–52, and 55–57 have been amended. Claims 1, 7, 22, 25, 28, 29, 35, 48, 49, 53, 54, 58 have been canceled. Claims 59–70 have been added. Hence, Claims 2–6, 8, 10, 15–21, 23, 24, 27, 30–34, 36, 38, 43–47, 50–52, 55–57, and 59–70 are pending in this application.

The added claims and amendments to the claims do not add any new matter to this application, and are supported by the Specification. The amendments and cancelations to the claims were made in the interest of expediting prosecution as to Claims 52 and 57, and not for any reason related to the patentability of the amended or canceled claims.

All issues raised in the Office Action are addressed hereinafter.

I. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 52 and 57 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Office Action indicated that Claims 52 and 57 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claim. Applicant has amended Claims 52 and 57 accordingly.

Claim 52 has been rewritten to include all elements recited in former independent Claim 1. Additionally, Claim 52 has been rewritten to include additional elements recited in former intervening Claim 48, with minor changes to correct formalities.

Claim 57 has been rewritten to include all elements recited in former independent Claim 29. Additionally, Claim 57 has been rewritten to include additional elements recited in former intervening Claim 54, with minor changes to correct formalities.

Claims 52 and 57 are now allowable. Removal of the objection is requested.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS BASED ON 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-8, 10, 15-25, 27-36, 38 and 43-51, 53-56 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,857,020 to Chaar et al. (hereinafter “*Chaar*”).

Claims 1-8, 10, 15-25, 27-36, 38 and 43-51, 53-56 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,082,463 to Bradley et al. (hereinafter “*Bradley*”).

Claims 1-8, 10, 15-25, 27-36, 38 and 43-51, 53-56 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,801,532 to Anandakumar et al. (hereinafter “*Anandakumar*”).

Claims 1-8, 10, 15-25, 27-36, 38 and 43-51, 53-56 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,405,250 to Bradley et al. (hereinafter “*Lin*”).

Applicants disagree with each of the grounds of rejections, and hereby traverse each rejection. However, in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicants have amended or canceled most of these claims. Applicants reserve the right to argue the patentability of the claims, as previously constituted, at a later date.

**CLAIMS 1, 7, 22, 25, 28, 29, 35, 48, 49, 53, 54, 58**

Claims 1, 7, 22, 25, 28, 29, 35, 48, 49, 53, 54, 58 have been canceled. The rejections as to these claims is therefore moot. Removal of the rejections is requested.

**CLAIMS 2-6, 8, 10, 15-19, 30-34, 36, 38, 43-47, 50-51, AND 55-56**

Claims 2-6, 8, 10, 15-19, 30-34, 36, 38, 43-47, 50-51, and 55-56 have been amended to depend from either Claim 52 or Claim 57, thereby overcoming the rejections as to those claims. Since Claims 52 and 57 are allowable, Claims 2-6, 8, 10, 15-19, 30-34, 36, 38, 43-47, 50-51, and 55-56 are presently allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as their respective parent claims. Removal of the rejections as to these claims is requested.

In addition, each of Claims 2-6, 8, 10, 15-19, 30-34, 36, 38, 43-47, 50-51, and 55-56 recites at least one feature that independently renders it patentable. However, to expedite prosecution in light of the allowability of Claims 52 and 57, further arguments for each

independently patentable feature of Claims 2–6, 8, 10, 15–19, 30–34, 36, 38, 43–47, 50–51, and 55–56 are not provided at this time. Applicants reserve the right to further point out the differences between the cited art and the novel features recited in the dependent claims.

### **CLAIMS 20, 21, 23, 24, AND 27**

Independent Claims 20 and 27 have been amended to recite features substantively similar to those of Claim 52. As the allowability of Claim 52 evidences, at least one or more of these amended features are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claims 20 and 27 are presently allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as Claim 52. Since Claims 21, 23, and 24 depend from Claim 20, and include each and every feature of Claim 20 by dependency, Claims 21, 23, and 24 are also allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as Claim 52. Reconsideration of the rejection as to Claims 20, 21, 23, 24, and 27 is respectfully requested.

In addition, each of Claims 20, 21, 23, 24, and 27 recites at least one feature that independently renders it patentable. However, to expedite prosecution in light of the allowability of Claims 52 and 57, further arguments for each independently patentable feature of Claims 20, 21, 23, 24, and 27 are not provided at this time. Applicants reserve the right to further point out the differences between the cited art and the novel features recited in the dependent claims.

### **III. ADDED CLAIMS**

Claims 59–70 have been added. Claims 59–61 depend from Claim 52, and are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons that Claim 52 is allowable. Claims 68–70 depend from Claim 57, and are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons that Claim 57 is allowable.

Claim 62 is similar to Claim 52, except that it recites a “determined state transition” as opposed to a “determined state.” Applicants submit that Claim 62, and its dependent claims 63 and 64, are patentable over the cited references for at least one or more of the reasons that Claim 52 is allowable.

Claim 65 is similar to Claim 57, except that it recites a “determined state transition” as opposed to a “determined state.” Applicants submit that Claim 65, and its dependent claims 66 and 67, are patentable over the cited references for at least one or more of the reasons that Claim 57 is allowable.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and the issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If there are any additional charges, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if the Examiner believes that such contact would be helpful in furthering the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: July 31, 2008

/KarlTRees#58983/

Karl T. Rees, Reg. No. 58,983

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550  
San Jose, CA 95110  
(408) 414-1233  
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076